REMARKS

As previously discussed with the Examiner by telephone, a Response to the Official Action of October 23, 2002 and an Information Disclosure Statement were filed on February 4, 2003, in the referenced patent application. Through informal communication, the Examiner considered the Amendment and reported that the Amendment filed did not place the application in form for allowance. According to the PAIR records, the February Amendment and Information Disclosure Statement were entered in the prosecution file on April 21, 2003. No Advisory Action was mailed and no initialed PTO-1449 Form was mailed. An indication in the next communication of consideration of the publications supplied in the Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

In furtherance of the request for continued examination filed April 12, Applicants amend their application. The amendment and following remarks are based upon the claims as previously pending. The Examiner is requested to approve the drawing figure changes that were part of the February 4, 2003 filing entered April 21, 2003.

In this Amendment, the two pending independent claims, claims 13 and 15 are emended by describing the input and output lines and the existence of an open stub capacitance connected respectively to the input and output line remote from the input and output terminals of the transistor. In the embodiment of the invention illustrated in Figure 1 the open stub capacitance is designated as L1. In the embodiment of the invention illustrated in Figure 6, the same designation is employed for the open stub capacitance connected to the output line of the transistor.

The only written rejection so far made was not a prior art rejection but a rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. According to the undersigned's understanding from the informal communication with the Examiner, that rejection has been overcome by the response that was originally filed on February 4, 2003. Now, the Examiner is of the view that page 117 and its Figure 5.16 of the Japanese language publication "Microwave Semiconductor Circuits, Basis and Application," originally submitted February 4, 2003, anticipates the invention as previously claimed. Assuming this understanding is correct, the rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the foregoing amendments.

Figures 10(A) and 10(B) of the patent application illustrate prior art structures. In these structures an open stub capacitance L1 was employed, respectively indicated in the figures as a distributed element and as the equivalent lumped element. The value of this capacitance was changed, as indicated in the Smith chart of Figure 11, to adjust input and output impedance. However, this adjustable capacitance was insufficient to compensate for

changes in the input and output capacitances of the transistor due to changes in the input and output capacitance when an MIM capacitor was used at the input as in the embodiment of Figure 1 of the patent application or at the output as indicated in the embodiment of Figure 6 of the patent application. The changes in capacitance of these MIM capacitors was due to variation of the thickness of the electrically insulating film that forms the dielectric film of the MIM capacitors.

The desired compensation could not be achieved because the prior art open stub capacitances had fixed values, independent of the thickness of the insulating film used as the dielectric film in the MIM input and output capacitors. However, when the open stub capacitance itself is also an MIM capacitor having a capacitance that varies inversely with the thickness of the electrically insulating film, then adequate compensation of the input and output capacitances, for example with respect to the embodiments of Figures 1 and 6, respectively, can be achieved. In other words, by employing MIM capacitors as not only input and output capacitances connected, respectively, to the input terminal and the output terminal of the transistor, but also as open stub capacitances connected at the input line or the output line of the circuit, the desired compensation can be achieved.

The amended claims are clearly directed to this structure that provides an advantageous result. Neither the prior art as described in the patent application nor Figure

5.16 of the publication supplied with the previous response discloses or suggests the arrangement that is described by the claims now submitted. Accordingly, those claims should now be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Wyand, Registration No. 29,458
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: May 29, 2003
JAW:ves